REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-2, 6, 8, 22-23, 25, 27, 29, and 31 are amended. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23, 25-44 and 54-56 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-2, 6, 22-23, 25, 29, and 31 are amended to clarify the features of a relationship of a set displaying plane and a child part and a parent part according to an aspect of the present invention. (See, for example, paragraph [00136]). Claims 8 and 27 are amended to correct informalities.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

ITEM 3: OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

In item 3, the Examiner objects to the drawings contending the "informal drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination." (Action at page 2).

As discussed during the in-person interview with the Examiner conducted on March 8, 2005, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the features of the independent claims are supported by the drawings and discussed in the specification in a manner to clearly point out the claimed subject matter.

In addition, Applicant respectfully notes that although the Examiner has indicated that the drawings are "not of sufficient quality to permit examination," the Examiner's in-depth comments on pages 2-26 of the Action indicate that the Examiner has conduced an extensive examination of the present application.

Applicant request the objection be withdrawn and that the drawings are of sufficient quality to permit examination.

ITEM 5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-23, 25-44 AND 54-56 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AUTOCAD (AUTOCAD USER'S GUIDE, AUTO DESK DEC 5TH, 1997

The Examiner rejects claims 1-23, 25-44 and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by AutoCAD (AutoCAD User's Guide, Auto DESk Dec5th, 1997). The rejections are traversed.

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that

the reference must discuss every aspect of a claimed invention. AutoCAD does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited in the present application's independent claims

Independent claims 1-2 and 6, all as amended, recite a device, using claim 1 as an example, including "managing attribute information of a parent part and a child part and arranging information of a set displaying plane for making a body section defined based on a plane of at least one of the parts;. . . generating a three-dimensional section of the body cut by the set displaying plane according to the management data of the management means, . . . updating the arranged information managed by the management means by corresponding to the transfer or rotation of the set displaying plane, wherein a position of a set displaying plane of a child part is updated both upon an update of the attribute information of the parent part and upon an update of a set displaying plane of the parent part.

Independent claims 22-23, 25 and 29, all as amended, respectively recite a method, a computer-readable storage for storing the program, and a device, using claim 22 as an example, "managing management data of one or plural set displaying planes for cutting the body to make the section and of the attribute information of a child part and a parent part and of set displaying planes with the relation information with the child part and the parent part and set displaying plane, which are made by the same data structure; registering the management data; displaying the section and set displaying plane with the relation information; and updating the managing of the management data by arranging the relation among the child part and the parent part and the set displaying plane managed management data by corresponding to the designation of transfer or rotation of the set displaying plane and transfer or rotation of the parts."

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must discuss every aspect of a claimed invention. AutoCAD does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited in the present application's independent claims

AutoCAD does not discuss, for example, that a position of a set displaying plane of a child part is updated both upon an update of the attribute information of the parent part and upon an update of a set displaying plane of the parent part. Further, Auto CAD does not discuss updating the managing of the management data by arranging the relation among the child part and the parent part and the set displaying plane managed management data by corresponding to the designation of transfer or rotation of the set displaying plane and transfer or rotation of the parts.

Applicant submits that AutoCad does <u>not</u> discuss, for example, any such updating.

In page 16 of the Action, the Examiner contends that "the top Figure on Page 532 of AutoCAD discloses every single feature mentioned above."

Applicant submits that the Examiner is incorrectly interpreting interpret the "clipping plane" discussed by AutoCAD as discussing the set displaying plane as recited in the claims of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that as understood in the art a set displaying plane is <u>not</u> discussed merely by a discussion of a clipping plane.

For example, as understood in the art, a clipping plane is defined as a "plane that defines the front or back of the view cube, the portion of a 3D design displayed in a view." (See, for example, U.S. Glossary at http:www.efl.fhwa.dot.gov/manuals/dv/glossary/#C). Further, the attribute information discussed in AutoCad is merely additional information such as an interactive label or tag to identify a part , e.g., a name, a number, owner name or price or part.

AutoCAD merely discusses (page 440-441) that "(y)ou can extract attribute information from a drawing and create a separate text after you create a template file, Auto CAD uses that file to determine what attribute information to extract from the file, " and (page 614) that a "spherical projection warps the texture both horizontally and vertically."

AutoCAD does <u>not</u> discuss managing attribute information of parts and one or plural kinds of attribute information of a set displaying plane, as the Examiner contends.

Further, according to an aspect of the present invention management means manage attribute information of <u>both</u> the parent part and child part, and both information are stored in a same data-structure with relation information, wherein such relation information is set information regarding a relationship between the attribute information of the parent part and child part.

In addition, according an aspect of the present invention, update means manages updating the attribute information of the parent part and child part, together, by corresponding to a transfer of rotation or the set displaying, and transfer or rotation of the parts.

Summary

Since features recited by each of the independent claims are not discuses by the art relied on by the Examiner, withdrawal of the foregoing rejections and allowance of claims 1-23 and 25-44 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _November 7, 2005_

By: _/Paul W. Bobowiec/_
/Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501